

### **REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Final Office Action mailed on January 23, 2007, and the references cited therewith.

No claims are amended or added and claims are 19, 22, 30, and 47 are canceled; as a result, claims 1-18, 20-21, 23-29, 31-46, and 48-74 are now pending in this application.

#### **§ 103 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-6, 9-12, 14, 16, 19 (now canceled), 20, 21, 23, 27-29, 31-37, 39, 40, 42-43, 46, 49-51, 54 and 57-74 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,070,247). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Claim 1 recites “a docking station including speakers and a media drive” and “wherein said docking station is configured to selectively and releasably couple a projector to said docking station.” The Examiner stated in the Office Action with regard to the Wallace reference, “Cart 56 houses all elements of conferencing system 10 including docking station 14 and projector 28 has at least one speaker. In this device the docking station is further docked.” The docking station in Wallace refers to a computer docking station. (col. 2, lines 58 and 61)

The Examiner remarks in the Office Action at page 2 that the system in the Wallace reference has a projector that “has at least one speaker.” Whereas, claim 1 recites “a multimedia display device comprising a docking station including speakers and a media drive.” The Wallace reference does not teach or suggest the multimedia display device of claim 1, but appears to teach a multi-media conferencing system that electronically links various components together, which does not contain a docking station with speakers and a media drive.

Claim 20 recites “a docking station for supporting said image projection device” and “selectively coupling said image projection device to said docking station by

mounting said image projection device onto said docking station.” The Wallace reference does not teach or suggest the method of claim 20, but rather, appears to teach a multi-media conferencing system that electronically links various components together, which does not couple an image projection device to a docking station by mounting the image projection device onto the docking station.

Claim 32 recites a multimedia display device that includes a “projection means” and a “housing means including audio means” and “media generating means” that is “configured to structurally and communicatively couple said projection means” and is “further configured to selectively and releasably couple with said projection means.” The Wallace reference does not teach or suggest the multimedia display device of claim 32, but rather, appears to teach a multi-media conferencing system that electronically links various components together, none of which contain a housing with audio and media generating capability.

Claim 42 recites “a method of making a docking station” with “a body of said docking station” and “said body includes a media drive and cavity configured to receive a projector, with said body configured to selectively and releasably couple said projector” and “a speaker in said body of said docking station.” The Wallace reference does not teach or suggest the method of claim 42, but rather, appears to teach a multi-media conferencing system that electronically links various components together, none of which contain a body with a speaker and media drive that can receive a projector and selectively and releasably couple the projector.

Claim 49 recites “a docking station” with “a plurality of multimedia components including a speaker and media drive within a housing” to “selectively and releasably couple a projector to said multimedia components.” The Wallace reference does not teach or suggest the docking station of claim 49, but rather, appears to teach a multi-media conferencing system that electronically links various components together, none of which contain a speaker and media drive in a housing that can selectively and releasably couple the projector.

Claim 58 recites “a projector” and “a docking station including a speaker and media drive within a housing configured to selectively and releasably couple to said projector.” The Wallace reference does not teach or suggest the system of claim 58, but rather, appears to teach a multi-media conferencing system that electronically links various components together, none of which contain a speaker and media drive within the housing of a docking station that can selectively and releasably couple the projector to the docking station.

The system in Wallace couples a mouse, a Zip drive, a CD ROM drive, an HDD, a smart board, multi-function printer, a video projector, and a notebook computer to a docking station. (col. 2, lines 57-67 and col. 3, lines 1-6). But fails to teach or describe a device, system, or method to selectively and releasably couple a projector in a docking station, as recited in independent claims 1, 20, 32, 42, 49, and 58.

The Examiner states in the Office Action at page 4 that “it is well known in the art that commercially available printers or notebooks, such as printer 26 or notebook 30, are designed to be releasably coupled from other system components.” The Examiner has not provided a reference that teaches a device, system, or method that selectively and releasably couples a projector in a docking station. Applicant requests such a reference be provided if the Examiner is to maintain the §103 rejection of independent claims 1, 20, 32, 42, 49, and 58.

The Wallace reference does appear to provide for a docking station as part of a greater multi-media conferencing system that electronically links these components together, but does not teach or suggest a docking station with speakers and a media drive that allows a projector to be selectively and releasably coupled to it. The coupling of electronic components in the Wallace reference does not make obvious the docking station with speakers and a media drive that allows a projector to be selectively and releasably coupled to it of claims 1, 20, 32, 42, 39, and 58.

The independent claims 1, 20, 32, 42, 39, and 58 provide a novel docking station that is used to selectively and releasably couple the projector to the docking station. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the Wallace reference does not teach or

suggest each and every element and limitation of independent claims 1, 20, 32, 42, 49, and 58. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of independent claims 1, 20, 32, 42, 49, and 58, as well as those claims that depend therefrom.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Claims 7, 8, and 24-26 were objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowance of this subject matter and will consider the allowable subject matter of these claims in a future action.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Timothy F. Myers at (541) 715-4197.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AF Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 22nd day of March, 2007.

Alison L. Suberdan  
Name

[Signature]  
Signature

Respectfully Submitted,  
Daniel R. Dwyer, et al.

By Applicants' Representatives,  
BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC  
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500  
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By: [Signature]  
Jeffery L. Cameron  
Reg. No. 43,527

Date: 3/22/07